

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/690,484	10/21/2003	Stefan Dolansky	DOLANSKY	3854
75	90 06/21/2006		EXAMINER	
Henry M. Feiereisen Suite 4714			SHAH, KAMINI S	
350 Fifth Avenu	ıe		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY 10118			2128	
			DATE MAILED: 06/21/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/690,484	DOLANSKY ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Russell Frejd	2128		
The Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication a ply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORT WHICHEN - Extensions after SIX (6 - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP YER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR of MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perioply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staticeived by the Office later than three months after the maint term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on 22	December 2004.			
2a)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)☐ Sind	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
clos	ed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposition o	f Claims				
4a) 0 5)	m(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdom(s) is/are withdom(s) is/are allowed. m(s) <u>1-9 and 11-13</u> is/are rejected. m(s) <u>10</u> is/are objected to. m(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.			
Application P	apers				
10)☐ The Appl Rep	specification is objected to by the Examindrawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a circum and a circum accement drawing sheet(s) including the corresponds or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to by the late of a common or by the late of a common or by the late of the drawing of the late of the lat	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊠ Ackr a)⊠ Al 1.⊠ 2.□ 3.□	owledgment is made of a claim for foreig b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
2) Notice of D	eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate		
	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0)/Mail Date <u>10.21.03</u> .	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)		

In re Application of: Dolansky et al.

Examination of Application #10/690,484

1. Claims 1-13 of application 10/690,484, filed on 21-October-2003, are presented for examination.

Specification Objections

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In section 0013, [line 3] "a axis" is understood to mean "an axis".

In section 0026, [line 3] "controller1" is understood to mean "controller 1".

In section 0030, [line 1] "a axis" is understood to mean "an axis".

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, particularly:

In regard to claim 2, [line 12] the phrase "using said desired axis values"; and [line 15] the phrase "being connected for".

In regard to claims 2 and 4, [line 2] the term "the computer" lacks antecedent basis (possibly the auxiliary computer).

In regard to claim 6, the term "a simulation" might be construed to mean "the simulation".

In regard to claim 8, the phrase "is adapted to be".

In regard to claim 9, [line 2] the terms "said machine model" and [line 3] "said auxiliary downstream computer" lack antecedent basis.

In re Application of: Dolansky et al.

In regard to claim 10, [line 1] the phrase "one of the axes", [line 2] the phrase "at least one", and [line 5] the phrase "of the axes" could refer to actual or desired axes.

In regard to claim 12, [line 8] the phrase "using said desired axis values"; and [line 13] the phrase "being connected for".

Specification Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification in sections 0030 and 0031, uses the phrases: "In a manner well known in the art...", "in a suitable manner well known in the art", "in a suitable way well known in the art", to disclose the details for calculating the values of an NC-model 4 of a(n) axis [0030] and a PLC-model 5 for an axis [0031], and therefore, do not enable one of ordinary skill to use applicant's invention.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

In re Application of: Dolansky et al.

5.1 Claims 1-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article authored by Lo, entitled *A Tool-Path Control Scheme for Five-Axis Machine Tools*.

Lo discloses: [claims 1 and 11-13] simulating the mechanical behavior of the mechanism of machine tools or production-line machines having multiple drive controllers for driving multiple axis [p. 87, section 7. Conclusion];

a digital controller producing desired axis values [p. 79, section 1. Introduction];

an auxiliary computer for receiving the desired axis values from the controller [p. 79, Introduction, see "interpolator"]; math model means for calculating actual axis values from the desired axis values using math models of drive controllers of the respective axes, including models of both regulated and unregulated drive controllers [p. 81, section 4. Proposed five-axis control system, especially part (1) a direct-kinematics transformation algorithm that calculates the practical tool position]; a mechanism model for generating a state signal using the actual axis values and supplying the state signal to the digital controller as feedback, thereby simulating both regulated and unregulated axes of the machine [p. 81, section 4, especially parts (2)-(4) of Fig. 6 describing an error model for calculating the deviation, orientation, and tracking-lag errors; a control law eliminating the errors; and a matrix for transforming the control fed back [earlier in the same paragraph] to the axial drives].

In regard to claim 2, computer-numerical control [p. 79, Introduction].

In regard to claims 3-5, a computer performing simulation and emulation of the digital controller that is separate from the auxiliary computer [Fig. 6, the servo controller and the interpolator].

In regard to claim 6, a real-time simulation [p. 79, c. 2, par. 2, p. 87, c. 2, Conclusion].

In re Application of: Dolansky et al.

In regard to claim 7, increasing a cycle time of the digital controller [p. 84, c. 1, par. 3].

In regard to claim 8, the mechanism model being adapted to be calculated in the auxiliary computer [p. 81, c. 2, par. 2].

In regard to claim 9, computing means for calculating the machine model, separate from the auxiliary downstream computer [Fig. 6, the interpolator and the servo controller].

Claim Objections

6. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response Guidelines

7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

7.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday

from 0530 to 1400 ET, **or** the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100

Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

In re Application of: Dolansky et al.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 12-June-2006

RUSSELL FREJD PRIMARY EXAMINER